

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-20 are pending in this application. In this Response, Applicants have amended certain claims because Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, and are desirable for clarification purposes, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents.

Claims 2, 9 and 16 were canceled without disclaimer or prejudice. Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were amended to incorporate the features of claims 2, 9 and 16 respectively.

No new matter has been added by the amendments herein. All amendments are fully supported by the specification and claims as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments at this time.

### **THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103**

Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,012,991 to Kim (Kim '991) for the reasons set forth on page 2 in the Office Action. In addition, Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,034,182 to Kashiwagi *et al.* (Kashiwagi '182) or U.S. Patent No. 6,251,991 to Takesue *et al.* (Takesue '991) or U.S. Patent No. 6,334,819 to Ichikawa *et al.* (Ichikawa '819) optionally in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,971,870 to Sullivan *et al.* (Sullivan '870).

Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are now moot. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejections, independent claim 1 now incorporates the features of dependent claim 2, independent claim 8 incorporates the features of dependent claim 9, and independent claim 15 incorporates the features of dependent claim 16. The Examiner did not reject claims 2, 9 and 16 on substantive grounds and stated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In particular, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 now further recite a golf ball having a cover that is comprised of an outer layer and an inner layer and where the presently claimed composition forms the inner layer. Kim '991 does not disclose this feature. In addition, Kashiwagi '182, Takesue '991, Ichikawa '819 and Sullivan '870, when taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest a golf ball having a cover comprised of an outer layer and inner layer where the presently claimed composition forms the inner layer.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable based on Examiner's comments in the Office Action.

### CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments still do not resolve all of the issues regarding patentability of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any remaining issues.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, with the provision for the required fee, to extend the time for response two month to and including December 29, 2003 since December 25, 2003 and December 26, 2003 are holidays and December 27, 2003 and December 28, 2003 fall on a Saturday and Sunday respectively. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP Deposit Account No. 195127, Order No. 20002.0099.

Respectfully submitted,

SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP

Dated: December 29, 2003

By: 

Kenneth Y. Lo, Registration No. 51,961  
For: John P. Mulgrew, Registration No. 47,809  
SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 424-7756 Telephone  
(202) 295-8478 Facsimile